```
1
                       UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
                    EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
2
                            WESTERN DIVISION
3
 4
     UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
5
               V.
                                         5:15-CR-363-1D
 6
     SHAMIEKA GOODALL
7
8
                            SENTENCING HEARING
                               JUNE 6, 2017
9
                 BEFORE THE HONORABLE JAMES C. DEVER III
                    CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
10
11
     APPEARANCES:
12
     On Behalf of the Government:
13
    LESLIE KATHERINE COOLEY, ASSISTANT U.S. ATTORNEY
     DENNIS M. DUFFY, ASSISTANT U.S. ATTORNEY
14
     United States Attorney's Office
     310 New Bern Avenue, Suite 800
    Raleigh, North Carolina 27601
15
16
     On Behalf of the Defendant:
17
    DAMON JOHN CHETSON, Esq.
     The Chetson Law Firm, PLLC
18
     19 West Hargett Street, Suite 900
     Raleigh, North Carolina 27601
19
20
     BENJAMIN HILTZHEIMER, Esq.
     The Hiltzheimer Firm, PC
21
     119 Orange Street, Suite 300
     Durham, North Carolina 27701
22
                         AMY M. CONDON, CSR, RPR
23
                         Official Court Reporter
24
                       United States District Court
                         Raleigh, North Carolina
25
               Stenotype with computer-aided transcription
```

```
(Tuesday, June 6, 2017, commencing at 9:50 a.m.)
1
2
                          PROCEEDINGS
3
               THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Chetson, Mr.
 4
    Hiltzheimer and Ms. Goodall.
5
               Is the defense ready to proceed?
 6
               MR. CHETSON: We are, Your Honor.
7
               THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Duffy and Ms. Cooley.
8
               Is the Government ready?
9
                          Yes, Your Honor.
               MR. DUFFY:
10
                          At this time, I'd ask that Ms. Goodall be
               THE COURT:
     sworn or affirmed.
11
12
          (The defendant was duly sworn.)
13
               THE COURT: Ms. Goodall, do you understand that
14
    having been sworn, that your answers to my questions are
    subject to the penalty of perjury, ma'am?
15
16
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
17
               THE COURT: Have you taken any kind of medicine or
    any other substance in the last 48 hours that would affect your
18
    ability to hear and understand these proceedings?
19
20
               THE DEFENDANT:
                              No, sir.
21
               THE COURT: Do you know why you're here today?
22
               THE DEFENDANT:
                              Yes, sir.
23
               THE COURT: Mr. Chetson, do you have any reason to
24
    doubt Ms. Goodall's competence going forward today?
25
               MR. CHETSON:
                             No, Your Honor.
```

THE COURT: Does the Government have any reason to doubt Ms. Goodall's competence going forward today?

MR. DUFFY: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Based on Ms. Goodall's answers to my questions, my observations of Ms. Goodall, and the answers from counsel, I find that Ms. Goodall is competent to go forward here today.

Ms. Goodall, you're here today having been convicted by a jury of two charges: Conspiracy to commit violations of the kidnapping statute and kidnapping and aiding and abetting. A jury convicted you of those offenses earlier this year.

In light of some cases from the Supreme Court of the United States, including the Booker, Rita, Gall, Kimbrough, Spears and Nelson cases, the guidelines are no longer mandatory; they're advisory.

Nevertheless, in accordance with those cases and numerous cases from the Fourth Circuit interpreting those cases, including the *Carter*, *Pauley*, and *Evans*, a sentencing Court still must take into account the now-advisory guidelines.

The Court does this by initially making findings of fact and calculating an advisory guideline range. The Court will then consider any motion that might be made that might move that range either up or down. I'll then consider all arguments that your lawyers make, both here in court and ones they already made on your behalf in the sentencing memorandum

```
they submitted, any statement you'd like to make, any victim
1
2
     allocution, and the arguments of the Assistant United States
3
     Attorney. I'll then determine your sentence and announce it
 4
     here in court today. That'll be the process we'll follow
5
     today.
 6
               Mr. Chetson, did you receive a copy of the
7
    presentence report?
8
               MR. CHETSON: We did, Your Honor.
9
               THE COURT: Ms. Goodall, did you receive a copy of
     that report?
10
11
               THE DEFENDANT:
                               Yes, sir.
               THE COURT: Did you speak with your lawyers about
12
13
     that report?
14
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
               THE COURT: At this time, the Court directs that the
15
     presentence report be placed in the record under seal.
16
               In accordance with Rule 32 of the Federal Rules of
17
     Criminal Procedure, the Court accepts as accurate the
18
     presentence report, except as to matters in dispute as set
19
20
     forth in the addendum.
21
               I have reviewed the entire report, including the
22
     addendum. The addendum does contain numerous objections.
23
               Ms. Goodall, you may have a seat while we work our
24
     way through these.
25
               Mr. Chetson, Mr. Hiltzheimer, do you want to be heard
```

on them?

MR. CHETSON: I don't need to be heard on them.

THE COURT: Does the Government want to be heard?

MR. DUFFY: No, Your Honor, not on the objections.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. I'm going to -- for purposes of completeness, and again, in looking at the letter, I'm going to go ahead and rule on them.

Obviously, there are numerous factual objections that are overruled. The Court does think by preponderance of factual description the PSR is accurate. To the extent there were specific objections to certain enhancements, I will rule on those now.

The first objection is a six-level offense enhancement under Section 2A4.1(b)1 for ransom demand or demand upon the Government. Section 2A4.1(b)1 applies "If a ransom demand or demand upon Government was made."

The guidelines do not define the term "ransom" but the Fifth Circuit has adopted the Merriam Webster definition that ransom is "Consideration paid or demanded for the release of someone or something in captivity." The United States v. Fernandez, 770 F.3d, 340, 343 (5th Cir. 2014). This is essentially the same definition that Black's Law Dictionary contains.

The text message demanded that Stephanie, who was Melton's state defense attorney, buy a pack of Newport

cigarettes, unwrap them and smuggle them into prison and that Stephanie and another person should correct the error of imprisoning him and fix this problem or else we'll start killing you family and we'll start with you father. The text messages then clarified if you follow my instructions and everything go good, we let your father go.

In context, the Court finds that the text message is clearly demanding consideration for the safe return of Mr. Janssen.

The Court also finds in the alternative that the text message represented a demand on the Government. The text message asked the Assistant District Attorney to fix the problem of Melton's supposedly unjust imprisonment. The record shows that the timing of the text messages and kidnapping around April 7, 2014, suggested that the kidnapping was motivated by deadline for filing a petition for discretionary review with the Supreme Court of North Carolina. The deadline was April 22nd, 2014.

Section 2B1.1B provides that acts taken within the scope or jointly undertaking criminal activity and furtherance of that criminal activity are to be considered.

Here, the Court does find that this conduct was reasonably foreseeable in connection with the criminal activity for which the defendant has been convicted, therefore, the enhancement applies.

The Second Circuit recently applied the standard enhancement in a case called *U.S. v. Acevedo*, 824 F.3d 179, 185 (2nd Cir. 2017). So that objection is overruled.

Section 2A4.1(b)(2)(A) provides a four-level enhancement if the victim sustained permanent or life-threatening bodily injury.

Permanent or life-threatening injury means injury involving a substantial risk of death, loss or substantial impairment of the function of a bodily member or mental faculty that is likely to be permanent or an obvious disfigurement that is likely to be permanent.

In the case of kidnapping, for example, maltreatment to a life-threatening degree, e.g., by denial of food or medical care would constitute life-threatening bodily injury.

See the commentary to the guideline.

The definition is disjunctive, it encompasses both severe injuries that may not be permanent and permanent injuries that may not be severe so long as the injuries are substantial. See *United States v. Price*, 149 F.3d 352, 354, (5th Cir. 1998).

Here, the -- certainly the depravation of food and water to the point Mr. Janssen hallucinated from dehydration was maltreatment to a life-threatening degree and the blood clot and permanent scars that Mr. Janssen sustained constitute direct degree of substantial injuries.

Again, the Court does find that these activities were taken within the scope of jointly undertaking criminal activity and in furtherance of that criminal activity, the Court finds that the horrific maltreatment of Mr. Janssen was reasonably foreseeable in connection with this criminal activity in light of Ms. Goodall's conduct; therefore, the enhancement applies. See generally, U.S. v. Acevedo, 824 F.3d, 179, 185 (2nd Cir. 2017), United States v. Davis, 19 F.3d 166, 171 (5th Cir. 1994).

I do find that she knew of this horrific maltreatment given her role in the kidnapping and her connection with the kidnappers, including Melton, Maynard and Martin and others.

Paragraph 87, probation applied a two-level enhancement under Section 2A4.1(b)(3) for the use of a dangerous weapon. The enhancement applies if a firearm was discharged or a firearm or dangerous weapon was otherwise used as those terms are defined in the guidelines.

Section 2A4.1 Comment Note 1 states that a dangerous weapon is an instrument capable of inflicting death or serious bodily injury or an object that is an instrument capable of inflicting death or serious bodily injury but closely resembles such an instrument, or the defendant used the object in a manner that created the impression the object was such an instrument. Comment Note 1(D) to Section 1B1.1.

A dangerous weapon is otherwise used if it is not

discharged but was used beyond mere brandishing, displaying, or possessing. *United States v. Young*, 87 F.3d 1310, the Fourth Circuit held that a stun gun used to incapacitate or threaten victims or bystanders would qualify as a dangerous weapon under the guidelines. See also *United States v. Quiver*, 805 F.3d 1269, 1272-1273 (10th Cir. 2015) and *U.S. v. Allen*, 561 F.3d 364, 375-376 (6th Cir. 2008).

Here, the defendant's co-conspirators used the taser, stun gun on Mr. Janssen to incapacitate him in his home. He also was struck on the head with the butt of a firearm. He also was tased repeatedly in the car.

This conduct qualifies under the guidelines and was within the scope of jointly undertaking criminal activity and in furtherance of that criminal activity.

In light of the evidence presented at trial, this Court finds that the conduct was reasonably foreseeable to Goodall that the co-conspirators engaged in this kidnapping would use a dangerous weapon to subdue the kidnapping victim. See *U.S. v. Acevedo*, 824 F.3d 179, 185 (2nd Cir. 2017), thus this enhancement applies.

There also is an objection to the sixth-level enhancement under Section 3A1.2(b) for a crime committed against an official victim that was motivated by the victim's status because the defendant allegedly lacked knowledge of the identity of the victim or the fact that the victim was related

to a public official or that a public official was the intended target of a plot.

The enhancement applies if the, "Victim was a Government officer or employee or a member of the immediate family of a Government officer or employee and the offense of conviction was motivated by such status. See Section 3A1.2(a) of the guidelines.

The enhancement is a six-level enhancement if the offense of conviction was an offense against the person, as that phrase is used in Chapter 2, Part A of the guidelines. See Section 3A1.2(b) of the guidelines.

The guidelines do not define what family members count as "immediate family". The Court notes that Black's Law Dictionary defines "immediate family" to include a person's parents.

Mr. Janssen, the victim, was targeted, kidnapped and held for ransom because he was the father of Colleen Janssen, a Government official, Assistant District Attorney in Wake County, thus the objection is overruled.

Moreover, the Court does find based on the evidence presented at trial that Ms. Goodall had the requisite knowledge and that also this enhancement should apply based on her knowledge of this fact during the course of the kidnapping. She certainly knew that that was the DA's father who was being held.

So that objection is overruled. 1 2 For purposes of Booker and its progeny, then, the 3 Court finds the Total Offense Level to be 43, and Criminal History Category to be 1, the Advisory Guideline Range to be 4 5 life imprisonment. 6 Does the Government object to that advisory guideline 7 range? 8 MR. DUFFY: No, Your Honor, we do not. 9 THE COURT: With the objections preserved, does the 10 defense object to that advisory guideline range? No, Your Honor. 11 MR. CHETSON: 12 THE COURT: I'll hear first from Mr. Chetson and Mr. 13 Hiltzheimer, and then I'll hear from Ms. Goodall, and then I'll 14 hear any victim allocution and then I'll hear from Mr. Duffy. 15 Yes, Your Honor. I'll be brief. MR. CHETSON: filed a sentencing memorandum, which I'm sure Your Honor 16 17 viewed. THE COURT: 18 I have. In addition, we filed a report provided 19 MR. CHETSON: 20 by Cindy Cottle, a forensic psychologist who interviewed our client on numerous occasions and conducted a series of 21 22 psychological examinations of our client. 23 I'll say briefly a couple things about Ms. Goodall 24 and then turn to the offense conduct. 25 First would be as the report in our sentencing

memorandum indicates, Ms. Goodall faced not only a poor upbringing, but an upbringing characterized by abuse, physical and sexual abuse, characterized by a lack of connections with any real family.

Ms. Goodall was essentially removed or kicked out of her mother's -- biological mother's household in light of tensions and what she perceived as racist conduct by the stepfather.

And that as a result of that, she lived in a number of foster homes before eventually being adopted by a social worker. And she was adopted in her early teens by the social worker,

Ms. Marshal Goodman.

And following that, given that she had been adopted at a fairly old age, the relationship between her and her now-adopted mother was not good.

And so several years later she was -- ran away. She lived for a period of time on the streets in Broward County. She met a man who was her senior and that either initially or over time developed into a very abusive relationship. So much so that she tells us that his mother advised her to get out of the relationship, to seek help at a woman's shelter because she might end up dead. She did get out of the relationship.

During this time, she was working in legitimate professions, legitimate jobs as a clerk at convenient stores in Florida. That was sporadic, however, and she reports also a

history of working as an escort. And the report documents various abuses that she suffered through that conduct. She is ashamed of that and that took some time for her to reveal to the psychologist and also to, frankly, us as attorneys.

With that having been said, looking for a connection with her stepbrothers, she moved to Georgia. And what we would say from the report is that Shamieka, as the test indicates that Dr. Cottle performed, that Shamieka suffers from a detachment or a need to feel as part of -- as though she was part of a community or family.

And Your Honor has sat through probably hundreds, maybe thousands of sentencing involving gang members and knows that gangs present themselves as a way of providing a community or a family. It's a false family and a false community, but a way of providing that to people from very difficult backgrounds.

And we would contend that that's in part what happened here. Notwithstanding the conduct, the jury found our client guilty of, that's what happened.

Your Honor has also had the opportunity to preside over Mr. Melton's trial and to hear Mr. Melton testify, to hear him make statements to this Court and to hear testimony about how Mr. Melton was a problem in the North Carolina jails where he was being held pretrial prior to his State trial, and in North Carolina Department of Corrections, not just with respect

to the use of cell phones through that, but through his ability to attract people into his gang and we would contend that while to the extent that the jury found that she was a member of this gang, to the extent there was evidence, that she joined the gang, that she is responsible for that conduct, but that a large part of that was driven by Mr. Melton and that her desire was to find a family or a sense of belonging which she lacked much of her childhood and that compelled her to join the gang.

Now I'd like to move -- I'm not going to say everything that's in the report because you've had an opportunity to read that and it's part of the record. But I'd like to talk a little bit, notwithstanding you overruled our objections, about the conduct of the other individuals in this case. I was here for the sentencings and I've seen the sentencings of Qauntavious Thompson, Tianna Maynard, Jakym Tibbs and the other individuals who were involved.

Your Honor is well-aware having sat through two trials that from the Government's evidence that Ms. Goodall was not present during any actual specific conduct; that is, the very violent beating of Mr. Janssen, violent acts that resulted in his abduction and the way he was treated, and those are particularly horrific facts.

I've been practicing for about 10 years and they are the most horrific facts that I've ever seen in a case; that I personally handled and they are egregious, and we are not

trying to gainsay those facts.

What we are saying is that Ms. Goodall's conduct was different in kind from the conduct of the other co-conspirators who were present physically at various locations where the conduct happened, who hit and struck Mr. Janssen, who knew specifically because they were in the home in southeast Atlanta with him, the conditions he was facing, had the opportunity to get him food and water and did not do so. Who saw him with his hand swelled and his body suffering and did virtually nothing to help him, and then with respect to Mr. Roberts, procure the pick and the shovel to dispose of the body. Ms. Goodall was not present.

Now, when the Government's evidence and when the evidence accepted obviously by -- and decided by this jury, but for Ms. Goodall's conduct as part of the conspiracy, this may not have occurred or would not have occurred depending on how you view that conduct, which is that she provided money. And that when the Government's evidence facilitated the connection between Jenna Martin and the rest of the conspirators and at some point during the conspiracy had contact with conspirators and perhaps assisted them in identifying the locations in southeast Atlanta. Your Honor of course understands that we're saying that with respect to what the Government has shown.

That having been said, we understand the Court's -- what will be the Government's contention, we expect that, but

for her conduct that may not or likely would have not occurred because providing the money was an important part of what the Government contended and showed was the conspiracy. That is different in kind from the conduct committed by the other individuals.

And so we would ask you to sentence Ms. Goodall consistent with all those principles in 3553(a). And I made some other sorts of arguments in the sentencing memorandum about the idea behind general and specific deterrence, which I'm sure Your Honor is well-aware of. We would contend that the literature tends to show that confidence in prosecution and conviction is more important than length of sentence.

She understands that having been involved in this conduct, as the Government has alleged, that she is going to suffer a very serious sentence today. We would simply ask that there be a chance at the end of that sentence that she see daylight.

So consistent with the other individuals, we would ask for a 360-month sentence. That is more than Jenna Martin; that is, if I'm recalling correctly, similar to Ms. Kramer; that is less than Tianna Maynard, who engaged in much more egregious conduct. So we would ask that that sentence be imposed upon her.

We would also ask that in terms of a recommendation -- we understand that the Court is likely to

separate out these defendants in the southeast. We would ask for a location in the southeastern part of the country. She doesn't have a specific location in mind, we talked about that. Southeast of the United States.

We would ask for -- as the report indicates, there was heavy marijuana use, we would ask for drug treatment and she would also ask for the opportunity to obtain her GED and any other skills or education available to her in the Bureau of Prisons.

THE COURT: At this time I'll hear from Ms. Goodall, if you'd like to make a statement, ma'am.

THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.

THE COURT: I'll hear from Mr. Duffy, I'll hear the victim allocution, whichever order you want to do it.

MR. DUFFY: Your Honor, we have two victims that will be allocuting. And, of course, victim allocute from Mr. Frank Janssen and he'll be followed by Colleen Janssen.

MR. JANSSEN: Thank you, Your Honor, for this opportunity. Thank you for all your work, your patience and your legalese interpretations.

It's been more than three years since the kidnapping. You might think that's both a long time. I know it seems that way to my family, my extended family and everyone who knows me.

However, to me it's like it happened yesterday. The time I spent in the closet seemed like an eternity. The

numbness in my hands and feet are constant reminders along with the daily tragic events around us, our communities, around the world. What I went through pales in comparison to those events, yet they constantly remind me and refresh my memories. They continue to have a sobering effect on me while at the same time make me feel extremely grateful. Grateful for the efforts of law enforcement at all levels. Without each and every one of them doing their part, I would not be here today.

Without the diligence, the thoroughness and follow-through and the analysis of everything, especially Stephen Jessup and his crew, we would not be able to bring justice to all these people who were involved in this crime.

And also, finally, without the skills, the organization and the presentation of this case by Leslie Coolie, Dennis Duffy, and his staff, we would not be completing this final phase.

I'm not the kind who dwells on the past too much except to understand it and learn from it. But with this kidnapping, I am constantly thinking about it, aware of it, and reminded how quickly things can change. I've had lots of time to think and rethink about everything. I've had to relive the excruciating details during each of these trials and it never got easier.

I'm overwhelmed by the impact it had on all my family and friends as well as all that they've had to endure through

it all. I thank them all for their support.

I continue to speculate on your motivation, your actions, your behavior. I don't have a single answer.

Certainly, not one good. Well, one that would justify what you did.

Try as I might, I cannot understand why anyone would risk losing their freedom, in essence their life, unless for a greater cause such as God and country, and we have so many in our military and our first responders that do that to protect us.

So what was your cause? Was it worth your freedom?

Was it the money? The power? The status? Did you consider

the consequences of your actions? My guess is that you didn't.

You didn't consider Mr. Curtis, you befriended him and in return he provided you with transportation, assistance with moving money, food, friendship. You didn't shoot him, but you may have well done so. You outed him for potential of weapons, status, power. Lucky for him, he, too, survived.

Likewise, you didn't grab me. You didn't tie me up. You didn't lock me up, but you may as well done those things, you enabled all that; the power, money, status, they all drove you to this path.

Did you even think for a moment to ask yourself if this was the right thing to do or why? Perhaps you had a chance to think about that already or perhaps you're still

thinking about it. And maybe you do have an answer.

Hopefully, with this sentence here, you and others faced with similar circumstances will make a better decision in the future.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Janssen.

MR. DUFFY: Your Honor, Colleen Janssen.

MS. JANSSEN: Good morning, Judge.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MS. JANSSEN: I, once again, I find myself in a position of believing that I don't know that I can say anything better to you than what my parents just said, so I'm going to take a moment to brag.

My parents are amazing people. My father has been my hero since I was a little kid and my mother became equally my hero during all of this and I could not be luckier. I shouldn't have ever had to consider how lucky I am to get up every morning and have both of them, although I should every day, we all should.

I would just ask you to -- when you hear arguments that this defendant did not do any of the things herself that caused so much physical harm to my father, she managed to do that because she ingratiated herself enough that she didn't have to get her own hands dirty and she got to send other people out and help them do it.

Please take that into account and hold her responsible as I know that you will during all of these sentencings and put her in the right place for having hurt my heros.

THE COURT: Thank you.

At this time I'll hear from Mr. Duffy on behalf of the United States.

MR. DUFFY: Thank you, Your Honor.

The defense argues that Shamieka Goodall, a/k/a Mieka Diva is somehow a victim in this case; that her need for acceptance somehow made her susceptible to gang manipulations.

On page 8 of that psychological evaluation, she goes as far as blaming Jenna Martin for introducing her to the gang.

Your Honor, the facts which we presented as evidence make it abundantly clear that's a flat-out lie, the same she made to her evaluators are flat-out lies. Jenna Martin did not introduce her to gang members.

On page 5 and 6 of that evaluation, she indicates to the evaluator that she met Mr. Melton through a dating service in January of 2015. That's a lie. She also indicated she didn't learn that Mr. Melton was in prison until March of 2016; that's a flat-out lie, no two ways about it.

When you take the full measure of Shamieka Goodall's involvement in this gang, it's not a question of her seeking acceptance; that's not what she was doing. She was seeking

advancement. And she was willing to get that advancement at any price. Willing to do anything, even violence.

This fact was shown again, again, again, by indisputable facts. No suggestions the defense said that we might have proven this, we might have proven that. The facts speak for themselves.

It's indisputable at least by February 7th, 2014, Shamieka Goodall joined this gang. How do we know? Because she sent a picture of herself with Tianna Maynard to Mr. Melton. It was a picture of her sitting in the New Town Circle apartment where a couple months later Frank Janssen would be held in a small closet on the second floor.

Then we go on from February 7th. We know about this day, she's in the breadwinner lineup. How do we know? Fact.

We know because we looked at the notebook Tianna had. She's listed in the breadwinner lineup. Nothing to do with Jenna Martin. Jenna Martin doesn't even know these people exist yet. She hasn't been called in to be a driver yet. That all happened in early April.

Go to February 10th, three days later, we got toll records where she's communicating with Dewayne Seymore a/k/a Shooter. So she's already branching out and talking to Shooter. This isn't someone meekly joining a gang in the breadwinner line several rungs below Maynard and just trying to fit in quietly. This is someone within days reaching out and

communicating with higher ranking male gang members.

February 16, 2014, we have a text message from Tianna Maynard to Roberts, the head of the male line of the gang in Atlanta, saying Diva needs to talk to you ASAP. Except they don't use ASAP, they use DG SAP because it's Don G.

A week later, February 23rd, Goodall sends photos of herself in negligees and whatnot directly to Mr. Melton. So so much for the chain of command. It has taken her two weeks to jump the chain and get direct communications with Melton.

Basically, she's not seeking acceptance; she's seeking advancement and she's going to get it quicker. That's February 23rd.

At least by February 24th, she starts to groom Curtis Parrott, Curtis Parrott was the victim in Covington who she met when she worked at a convenient store. How do we know at least February 21st she's grooming him as a potential victim down the line? Because he sends her a money-gram. We have it. It's Exhibit 178. And again, that's February 24th.

Then we go to March 1st, 2014. By this point, she's involved in money-grams. How do we know that? Western Union transfers. Because we introduced copies of the Western Union Transfers between Shamieka Goodall and Patricia Kramer. That's Exhibit 323 and 324.

Then we get a couple weeks later, March 9th through 12, this is the Louisiana attempt. At some point in the

lead-up to the Louisiana attempt, there was some agreement for her to watch the children. How do we know? Because there's a text message. When it falls through, Shooter alerts the children that says Diva is boming, instead of coming, because they can't use "C" because of the Crips, coming to get them. That's on March 10th.

March 11th, while Tianna is in the middle of this mission, they take time for a 23-minute phone call between Tianna and Shamieka Goodall. How do we know that? We know it because of records, Exhibit 413A, page 9.

Then we go to March 15th when they come back. At this point, they are trying to set up the High Point mission. When they thought it was some relative of Stephanie Curtis that they were going to kidnap, they were having trouble getting a car, a mess up, kept getting delayed. At this point we have a text message from Shamieka Goodall to Mr. Melton saying, Sorry I messed up the move. I never want to be the reason you're not coming home.

At this point it's abundantly clear she's in on the plans. If this was going to be a drug deal that she was helping them with, it wasn't going to let him get home. Some ill-conceived extortion plan that we all know is never going to work, but it was something he was going to try, Mr. Melton.

Couple days later we have Curtis Parrott. This is where you really start to understand the makeup of Shamieka

Goodall. She brings this guy in and starts having a romantic relationship with him. She goes out to his location, she starts to befriend him, she starts to groom him in a way. He doesn't understand that he's being set up as a target that she can use for potential advancement.

What happens on March 15th or thereabout? Well, we know what happens. She, along with two colleagues or gang members, go to the location, they rob him, he gets away, as he's running away, they shoot him in the back. He's knocked down, they bring him to the hospital.

I think it's very telling the e-mails -- or the text messages, not e-mails -- that she says to Roberts right after the shooting, this is at Exhibit 378A, page 55, again, this is a fact, there is no two ways about it, it's in black and white right here in the exhibit. How does she respond? This is it, I'll quote it. How bad was it? Shit. They just picked his ass up at 320. Pigs out and all right now. Donna GZ. And then she continues and says, Is he X'd out? This is a guy she had a relationship with. She's talking tough, using X'd out.

The next day the police come to talk to her. We heard the audio or portions of that interview where she's like, oh, my gosh, I can't believe he's hurt. I feel so bad for him. Can I visit him at the hospital? They talked to her. She basically is very polite. She talks to him about concern for this guy. As soon as they leave, what does she say to Clifton

Robert, again 378A, page 55, Books up, Yee, Yee is Clifford Roberts, the word on the dude he's in surgery now. Four investigators came up to where I worked. Then she indicates I already told Dizzy when it happens, I'll be the first person they come to. This is someone deeply involved in a gang and she's more than willing to put Curtis Parrot's life on the line if it's going to get her advancement.

Your Honor, that moves forward fairly quickly to March 31st, 2014. The text messages that she sends to Mr. Melton saying, Do you still need a driver? No two ways about it. She's setting up the driver, Jenna Martin, who's going to be used to kidnap Mr. Janssen. She's way more than a but-for person in this case. She's deeply involved in this gang and more than happy to commit violence if it's going to get her some chance of advancement.

April 1, 2014, she indicates to Mr. Melton, Soon I'll have you home to myself. At this point, she also in the -- couple text messages down asks for a soul catcher, which we know now from the gang lingo is a gun.

Then we get late evening of April 4th, going into Saturday morning, April 5th, 2014, she allows the gang to stage at her Covington house, same thing they did before they went to get Parrott and shoot him in the back. She provides them with money. They have a conference call with Mr. Melton. They use the money to get gas, to get clothes, to buy zip ties, to get

food on the way over. They go ahead and kidnap Mr. Janssen late in the morning on Saturday, April 5, 2014.

On the way back, the location falls through. And if you look at her toll records and Mr. Melton's toll records, she, among many other people, were all about trying to find a backup location to put Mr. Janssen. Where is it? It ends up being at New Town Circle Apartment that she sent that picture to Mr. Melton or the one she was in with Tianna Maynard.

During the time that Mr. Melton is being -Mr. Janssen is being held, we have communications with Jenna
Martin that she's on the text message with, also calls. And
then the morning after Mr. Janssen is freed by the FBI, we have
calls between Shooter or Dwayne Seymore and the defendant
talking about what happened, who is arrested. This is a person
deeply involved in gang life and fortitude of gang life.

The bottom line with regard to Shamieka Goodall is she is not a victim. She's a predator. And her MO, she looks for her opportunity, she exploits it, and she has no qualms about violence. We saw this with Curtis Parrott. That's the history, that's the circumstances of Ms. Goodall that you should take -- we would argue that you should take in mind when you're looking to fashion a sentence for her.

The nature and circumstances of the crime:

Obviously, it's a heinous, violent crime. The impact on the family I can't say any better than Mr. Janssen. It's always

going to seem like this thing happened yesterday. It is going to be a life-defining moment. I'm just a prosecutor on the case, and I can't stop thinking about that moment. Whenever I see April 5th creep up, I know that's the day of the robbery. I know the date June 6th, that's the day we started the trial last year. It all falls in like that. It's like that for me and I was just a peripheral player.

As far as the seriousness of the crime, Your Honor, we would suggest to you that in addition to Mr. Janssen himself as you've seen again and again and again by support of the Janssens in attending his trial, testifying and allocuting, this thing hit their whole family, not just Mr. and Mrs. Janssen, but their children, their extended family, the family here that they have supporting them.

As far as the promote respect, that factor that we look at under 3553(a), I don't think it could be understated the impact this kind of case has on the criminal justice system. The way the criminal justice system works in this country, as we all know, is we have prosecutors and we have defense counsel and we do our job and then the jury speaks and then we listen to what the jury says and that's the verdict. We all live with it.

The impact that a case like this has is that prosecutors, defense attorneys, you know, this is the kind of case that they look at that makes them wonder maybe a little

bit about how do I do my job if they are going to start putting hits out on us? We are not that kind of country. We have a justice system that's firmly established. We are law and order. We have a jury system. The jury speaks and go by what the jury says.

Your Honor, as far as just punishment and how the defendant fits in with everybody else, every other defendant in this case, with the exception of Mr. Seymore, was looking at a guideline range of life. Everybody. Mr. Seymore wasn't, not because he wasn't a violent guy, but he was old enough to understand after Warren Robbins in January of 2014, he's like I'm not going to do what this guy on the phone says and do murders in broad daylight. He jumped off and tried to form his own line of gang, whatever subsect it was going to be. He was going to continue doing crime, but he separated himself from the gang. As a result, he didn't get the six-level enhancement for the victim. Every other person in this case faced life. Regardless of what their connection was to the case, some faced a little more than life if there was a gun charge.

The difference between the defendant and many of these people, she chose to go to trial and not cooperate.

That's why those other people got less than life.

Your Honor, at the end of the day, with regard to Shamieka Goodall, it's the Government's position and one of the facts we look at is protecting the public interest, I believe

she's a predator, I think she's dangerous, I think she's manipulative. You just have to look at Curtis Parrott to really understand a lot about this woman.

As a result, Your Honor, we think the guideline range in this case of life is warranted and request a sentence of life.

Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Chetson?

MR. CHETSON: I don't have anything further, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Ms. Goodall, the Court recognizes its obligation to impose a sentence sufficient, but not greater than necessary, to comply with the purposes set forth in the statute.

I have considered all arguments that your lawyers have made both here in court and in the sentencing memorandum they submitted. I have considered the position of the United States. I have considered the advisory guideline range.

Among other things, I'm to consider the nature and circumstances of the offense and the history and characteristics of the defendant; the need for the sentence imposed to reflect the seriousness of the offense, to promote respect for the law and provide just punishment.

The need for the sentence imposed to deter others who might chose to engage in the criminal behavior that brings you

here; the need for the sentence imposed to protect the public from further crime by you; the need for the sentence imposed to provide you with needed educational, vocational training or medical care in the most effective manner; the need to avoid unwarranted sentencing disparities.

The Court has considered all the other factors listed in the statute, although I won't mention each one individually.

As for the nature and circumstances of the offense, the jury convicted you of two offenses: Conspiracy to commit violations of the kidnapping statute and kidnapping and aiding and abetting. The crimes in your criminal conduct in participating in the crimes were horrific.

The report recounts and referred both in the trial and today during argument the horrific nature of the kidnapping plot that you participated in in connection with kidnapping Mr. Janssen with the goal of getting Mr. Melton released from prison so that you could be more than his "wifey," which my memory is what he had you listed as on his phone, so that you can be together as part of the gang.

Mr. Janssen was viciously abducted from his home by the four people who went there, including Jenna Martin who you recruited into the kidnapping plot. They staged at your residence in Covington and you provided \$200 to them which they used for food and travel expenses to get to Wake Forest in order to kidnap Mr. Janssen.

You, I think the evidence shows, were involved in phone communications trying to find a different spot to hold Mr. Janssen. You absolutely knew it was a kidnapping. You were all in once you got into this gang. You were very cognizant of the New Town Apartment having lived there for a time with Ms. Maynard in early February, 2014.

The report recounts the events moving forward, including the plot in Louisiana where you're on the phone with Maynard during the course of that. I recognize that the jury didn't find that for purposes of an object, but I think it's ludicrous to think that you didn't know exactly what Maynard was doing in Louisiana when you were on the phone for 20 minutes during that plot.

You set up Mr. Curtis Parrott and participated in that vicious attack and assault as part of gang life and to get guns, to further the interest of the gang using the same modus operandi. Miraculously he survived after being shot in the back.

You did get interviewed by the police and they did release you, but you were in immediate text communications with your fellow gang members and that didn't slow you down because those events all preceded the kidnapping conspiracy leading to Mr. Janssen's abduction where, again, you assisted in providing money, staging, and then finding a different location and then in constant communication during and after

it, you knew full well everything.

As for your history and characteristics, I have read the report. I do think it's fair to say there were some inaccuracies in terms of the information that the psychologist received from you about your relationship with certain people, but I do recognize, as Mr. Chetson pointed out in his memo, the hardship that you endured as a child with your biological mother and notwithstanding the efforts of your adopted mother, your inability to get along with her and then you're ultimately leaving and looking for some sense of belonging and not just belonging at some low level, but to be a gang wife to the founder, Mr. Melton, was an important thing to you for whatever reason.

I do think it's important that the sentence promote respect for law. This is a crime that I think strikes at the very heart of our justice system, both with respect to prosecutors and defense lawyers and the justice system in general, an attack essentially on the rule of law that you were very comfortable participating in is an attack that needs to be punished and it will be today.

I have taken into account the sentences of others.

Others did cooperate. These principles have been discussed before, again, in a kidnapping case *U.S. v. Acevedo*, 824 F.3d 179, 186 (2nd Cir. 2017) noted issues associated with the difference of those who cooperate and that being something that

makes disparities not unwarranted.

Here, I don't think you're similarly situated with the others. I think you were at a sufficiently high level given your relationship with Melton; that you didn't have to go do all these things, but that you were all in. You were all in and all about it. And I reject any suggestion otherwise. You wanted him home to be with you and were going to do whatever it took and have him endure whatever he had to endure to make that happen. And I don't think there is an unwarranted sentencing disparity between the sentence you will receive today and the sentence that others have received.

I do think -- and I read the studies, I'm very familiar with them, on topics of general deterrence; and here, I do think specific deterrence is critical.

I think Ms. Goodall is accurately described as a predator, someone who needs to be incarcerated and society needs to be protected from today and will be in light of the horrific nature of her criminal behavior, the need to provide just punishment, the need to promote respect for the law, the need to be incapacitated.

Having fully considered the entire record of the case, pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984 and in accordance with the Supreme Court decision of *United States v. Booker*, it's the judgment of the Court that defendant, Shamieka Goodall, is hereby committed to the custody of Bureau of

Prisons to be imprisoned for a term of life on each count to be served concurrently.

Upon release from imprisonment, the defendant shall be placed on supervised release for five years. This term consists of five years on Count 1 and five years on Count 3 to run concurrently.

Furthermore, she shall comply with the mandatory and standard conditions as well as the following additional condition:

She'll participate in a narcotic addiction treatment program, mental health treatment program, consent to a warrantless search, cooperate in the collection of DNA. She'll pay a special assessment of \$200, which shall be due immediately. If she can't pay immediately, she'll pay through the Inmate Financial Responsibility Program in the amount of \$25 per quarter. I'm not going to impose a fine.

In accordance with counsel's request, I recommend that she serve her sentence in the southeast United States. I recommend that she be kept separate from all other co-defendants within the Bureau of Prisons. I recommend intensive substance abuse treatment. I recommend mental health treatment. I recommend vocational and educational opportunities.

I do think I properly calculated the advisory guideline range. I announce pursuant to U.S. v. Gomez-Jimenez,

1 750 F.3d 370 (4th Cir. 2014) and U.S. v. Hargrove, 701 F.3d 156 2 (4th Cir. 2012), that I'd impose the same sentence as an 3 alternative variant sentence if I have miscalculated the 4 advisory quideline range. 5 This is the sentence that is sufficient but not 6 greater than necessary for Shamieka Goodall. 7 Ms. Goodall, you can appeal your conviction if you 8 believe that your conviction was somehow unlawful or if there's 9 some other fundamental defect in the proceeding. 10 You also have a statutory right to appeal your sentence under certain circumstances, particularly if you think 11 12 your sentence is contrary to law. 13 With few exceptions, any Notice of Appeal must be 14 filed within 14 days of the judgment being entered on the 15 docket in your case. If you're unable to pay the cost of an appeal, you 16 17 may apply for leave to appeal in forma pauperis. 18 If you so request, the Clerk of Court will prepare and file a Notice of Appeal on your behalf. 19 20 Mr. Chetson, I think I made all the recommendations 21 you asked for. Were there any others? 22 MR. CHETSON: No, Your Honor. 23 THE COURT: Anything else from the United States? 24 MR. DUFFY: No, Your Honor. 25 THE COURT: I thank counsel for their work here

```
1
     today.
             That will conclude the matter with Ms. Goodall.
               (The proceedings were recessed at 10:48 a.m.)
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	UNITED STATE DISTRICT COURT
2	EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
3	
4	
5	CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL REPORTER
6	I, Amy M. Condon, RPR, CSR, Federal Official Court Reporter, in
7	and for the United States District Court for the Eastern
8	District of North Carolina, do hereby certify that pursuant to
9	Section 753, Title 28, United States Code, that the foregoing
10	is a true and correct transcript of the stenographically
11	reported proceedings held in the above-entitled matter and that
12	the transcript page format is in conformance with the
13	regulations of the Judicial Conference of the United States.
14	
15	Dated this 6th day of October, 2017.
16	
17	/s/ Amy M. Condon
18	Amy M. Condon, CSR, RPR U.S. Official Court Reporter
19	0.5. Official Court Reporter
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	